



Criminal Justice Consortium

March 19, 2014 2pm – 4pm
Office of Financial Management
302 Sid Snyder Avenue SW, Room 440
Olympia, WA 98501

Meeting Notes

I. Introductions

Present: Keri-Anne Jetzer (OFM-SAC), Thea Mounts (OFM-SAC), Michael Evans (DOC), Dawn Larsen (WASPC), Dan Schaub (JJRA), Lijian He (WSIPP), Jim Mayfield (DSHS-RDA), Alice Huber (DSHS-RDA), John Bell (AOC), Bob Marlatt (WSP), Cody Stoddard (CWU), Alice Zillah (Commerce), Graham Parrington (Commerce).

II. Legislative Update

Keri-Anne informed members that SB 6094 (make jail data available to specific agencies) died but the language from the bill was later added to mental health bill SB 6312. She added that HB 1651 passed and now allows the Caseload Forecast Council to share their juvenile disposition data.

III. Justice Reinvestment Initiative – Data Group

Keri-Anne briefed the members on the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) that Washington State has applied for. While discussing data with the Council for State Governments (CSG), the agency that would be doing the data analysis for the JRI, the need for a data consensus group was mentioned. CSG anticipates this group would act as a consortium of the various agencies housing and analyzing criminal justice data and would oversee and vet the analyses conducted by the CSG to ensure consistence, transparency and collaboration throughout the justice reinvestment process. Keri-Anne thought the Criminal Justice Consortium would be a perfect fit for that and asked members if they agreed. They agreed. If Washington is approved for the JRI work, work related to the data consensus group likely wouldn't take place until the fall.

IV. Consortium Intents/Guidelines - Draft

Members decided to table this topic until more members were available for further discussion.

V. Data-sharing Agreement Model - Draft

Members discussed the changes made based on feedback given at the January meeting. After the language has been modified, the next step is to have a contract person review the document. Thea and Keri-Anne offered to take it to the OFM contract person for review and comment.

- Disposition/Security applies to categories 2, 3 and 4
- 9.3 – make two sections of language, one for original data and one for hybrid data.
- New clause = For purposes of reporting and publishing articles, a de-identified dataset can be maintained according to publication guidelines. What about archivability? Data continue to live until the usefulness of the data supporting activities expires. Add “Where otherwise specified in writing” language and would be negotiated? Changing data for long-term archival data.
- Do disposition requirements listed meet or run counter to requirements used by other agencies, such as CTS?
- 23.3 – use both paragraphs or just one?

VI. Database Map – Draft

Keri-Anne updated the map to reflect changes and comments that had been sent to her. It was noted that the RCW referenced under JBRS would need to be updated after session.

During the last meeting, a request was made to provide information on the WSP and WASPC sex offender registration and malicious harassment databases. Keri-Anne wanted to confirm that such information was still of interest. It was determined that such information would not be necessary. Robert said that the malicious harassment data at WSP is in their hotfile and not permanent. Dawn said that the sex offender registration data at WASPC are sent to WSP and thus the datasets aren't drastically different.

Robert suggested adding a metadata table that shows the content, context and characteristics of the data in each of the datasets. Perhaps a link to the agencies data dictionary could be included.

VII. Public Disclosure Questions for Roslyn Marcus at April Meeting

Keri-Anne talked with Ro Marcus at OFM about speaking to the Consortium in April. Ro agreed and requested any specific questions be sent to her before the April meeting. Members had the following questions to submit:

1. How to keep the consistency of public disclosure interpretation (i.e different levels of government have a different interpretation)? Is there one person who can/does make the final decision? Are there ways to make this a more logical process?

2. How do the public disclosure laws and criminal justice standards relate to each other? Does one have precedence?
3. Can Agency B send a public disclosure requestor asking for Agency A data that was obtained by Agency B for research purposes back to the source (Agency A) to fulfill the request? The idea is that the source agency would be the expert on that data.
4. Is a 'hybrid' dataset (dataset that combines data from at least one outside agency, ex. OFM data merged with DOC data) considered an 'original' dataset as regards public disclosure requests?

Keri-Anne asked how long the members would like to give to discussing the public disclosure issues at the next meeting. Members indicated an hour would suffice.

VIII. Next steps

- Make more modifications to model data-sharing agreement and ask contract person to review.
- Keri-Anne will contact members individually to gather content, context and characteristic information on the data in the database map.
- Keri-Anne asked the members how they would like to proceed with the limited future meetings available, i.e. continue to cover all issues at every meeting or focus in on specific issues per meeting. Members thought focusing in on specific issues per meeting made sense.

The next meeting is set for April 15th, from 10a – noon in the same location.